

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 and 12-16 were pending and rejected. Applicants hereby amend claims 5, 6, 10, 12 and 14 and cancel claims 1, 7, 8, 9, 13, 15 and 16. Further, Applicants add new claim 17. Accordingly, claims 2-6, 10, 12, 14 and 17 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicants amend claims 5, 6 and 12 with features similar to claim 2. New claim 17 is at least supported by FIG. 3.

***Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph***

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as alleged being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In view of the cancellation of claim 15, the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of this claim is moot.

***Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

*Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 10, 12 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hamada (EP 0 850 673) in view of Liu (U.S. Patent No. 6,077,164).*

Applicants traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit in view of the cancellation of claims 1, 8, 15 and 16 the rejection of claims 1, 8, 15 and 16 are moot.

**Claim 2, 5, 6, 12 and 14**

Claim 2 recites, *inter alia*, basic string storage means for storing a plurality of basic strings and substitute string storage means for storing a substitute string corresponding to each of

at least one of the plurality of basic strings stored in the basic string storage means, wherein the basic strings and the substitute strings are different. In the rejection of claim 2, the Examiner asserts that the commands to do the same special attacks are different depending on whether one is using speech or character input. However, the Examiner does not address the feature of “the basic strings and the substitute strings are different”. As such, we would request the Examiner to point out where Hamada and Liu disclose each and every feature recited in the claims.

In particular, Hamada and Liu do not teach or suggest two different strings (basic and substitute strings) and displaying the basic or the substitute strings based on the input device selected.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Hamada discloses a special command for the purpose of recording his or her preferred voice sound for each button on the pad is input, and then a desired word is selected or input and recorded for each item of pad data. If this is done by selecting text on the TV screen, then non-specific speaker voice recognition is possible, and if desired words are input via the microphone 7, then specific speaker voice recognition is possible. As such, Hamada merely discloses non-specific speaker voice recognition and specific speaker voice recognition based on how the word was entered (text or microphone). However, this does not teach or suggest displaying a character input criteria or speech input criteria depending on whether or not a predetermined characteristic is provided.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that claim 2 is allowable.

Claims 4, 10, 15, 16 and 17

Claims 4, 10, and 15-17 depend from claim one of the independent claims that are allowable, and therefore claims 4, 10, 15 and 16 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

*Claims 7, 9, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Liu and Tananka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,544,123).*

Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the cancellation of claims 7, 9 and 13, the rejection of these claims are moot.

*Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Liu and Volk et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,673,401).* Applicants traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 3

Applicants respectfully submit that since claim 3 depends from claim 2 and since Volk does not cure the deficiency noted above with respect to claim 2, claim 3 is allowable over the cited reference at least by virtue of its dependency.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
Application No.: 10/527,067

Attorney Docket No.: Q86296

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ebenesar D. Thomas/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

---

Ebenesar D. Thomas  
Registration No. 62,499

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 6, 2008